

Date: Fri, 26 Aug 94 04:30:11 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #394
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Fri, 26 Aug 94 Volume 94 : Issue 394

Today's Topics:

CW VIEWS (2 msgs)
Repeater Coordination (quasi-repost)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available (by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 25 Aug 1994 15:50:15 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!darkstar.UCSC.EDU!news.hal.COM!olivea!
korie1!newsworthy.West.Sun.COM!abyss.West.Sun.COM!usenet@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: CW VIEWS
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article 2E5C8DB6@ornl.gov, wyn@ornl.gov (C. C. (Clay) Wynn, N4A0X) writes:
>In article <33g310\$8kq@abyss.West.Sun.COM> myers@bigboy.West.Sun.COM (Dana
Myers) writes:

```
>
>>Yes, some folks would indeed like to build wide area, high speed,
>                                     ^^^^^^^^^^  ^^^^^^^^^^^
>>reliable communications systems in the amateur service.  Yeah, these
>>folks might even want to use these systems.
>
>Wake up and smell the coffee.  HF (only that small portion of the amateur
>spectrum where access has a CW prerequisite) will not currently support
>56Kb, full duplex data exchange.  Your telephone currently or soon will.
```

To start with, let me state that I'm not advocating building a high-speed, wide area comm system on HF. In fact, I'm not stating which modes or frequencies

would be used.

At the same time, look at your words: HF will not currently support 56kb....

If we make sure to discourage this kind of experimentation on HF, it never will be developed.

>The Amateurs Into Digital Stuff zealots solution to this is to subjugate all
>modes on HF to a few digital modes if that is what it takes to get the
>necessary bandwidth and hence the free use of an RF carrier. They are
>making their initial incursion in the RTTY/CW/DATA subbands where the
>resistance is the weakest. The first step is to wipe out that troublesome
>CW which seems to be able to carry on QSO's inspite of all the QRM they can
>generate.

You seem to really dislike the use of digital modes on shared frequencies.
I'm sorry for that. However, as an evolving, experimental service, amateur
radio must accept that some modes will become popular as others become less
popular. For example, AM used to be very popular on the ham bands, and
(I'm told) the AM crowd (once the majority) resisted the deployment of SSB
and FM.

I find it amusing that you've coined that phrase "Amateurs Into Digital Stuff"
and haven't treated us to the acronym: AIDS.

* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ, DoD#: j | Views expressed here are

*

* (310) 348-6043 | mine and do not necessarily *

* Dana.Myers@West.Sun.Com | reflect those of my employer

*

* "Sir, over there.... is that a man?"

*

Date: 25 Aug 1994 15:52:37 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!darkstar.UCSC.EDU!news.hal.COM!olivea!
korie1!newsworthy.West.Sun.COM!abyss.West.Sun.COM!usenet@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: CW VIEWS

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article 2E5C92A1@ornl.gov, wyn@ornl.gov (C. C. (Clay) Wynn, N4A0X) writes:
>In article <33gbf9\$8ni@abyss.West.Sun.COM> myers@sunspot.West.Sun.COM (Dana
Myers) writes:

>>Path: stc06.CTD.ORN.L.GOV!fnnews.fnal.gov!gw1.att.com!news.bu.edu!olivea!korie1!
newsworthy.West.Sun.COM!abyss.West.Sun.COM!sunspot!myers

>

>>Attempts to "define" amateur radio, at least the US Amateur Radio Service,
>>need to be based on part 97, and vice-versa. For your reading enjoyment,
>>here is 47 CFR part 97.1:

>

>>97.1 Basis and purpose.

>

>> The rules and regulations in this Part are designed to provide an
>>amateur radio service having a fundamental purpose as expressed in the
> ^^^^^

>>following principles:

>

>>(a) Recognition and enhancement of the value of the amateur service to
>>the public as a voluntary, noncommercial communication service,
>>particularly with respect to providing emergency communications.

>

>>(b) Continuation and extension of the amateur's proven ability to
>>contribute to the advancement of the radio art.
> ^^^^^

>>(c) Encouragement and improvement of the amateur service through rules
>>which provide for advancing skills in both the communication and technical
>>phases of the art.
> ^^^^^^ (the art is radio art)

>>(d) Expansion of the existing reservoir within the amateur radio service
>>of trained operators, technicians, and electronics experts.

>

>>(c) Continuation and extension of the amateur's unique ability to
>>enhance international goodwill.

>

>Please notice that the preface is "radio". The art is "radio" art.
>It does not say "amateur telecommunication service" or "telecommunication art".
>Again, "radio" is a small subset of telecommunications.

Sure, but "radio" doesn't exclude the use of any related technology.

>Develop mobile data networks? I see nothing wrong with this. In fact
>this appears to meet 97.1 to a tee. Let's please don't try it on HF
>unless we can do it under the current rules and allocations or without
>bumping off other modes and operators in the RTTY/CW/DATA subbands.

I love it. The "do what you like, but don't infringe on my favorite
space" argument.

* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ, DoD#: j | Views expressed here are
*
* (310) 348-6043 | mine and do not necessarily *
* Dana.Myers@West.Sun.Com | reflect those of my employer
*

* "Sir, over there.... is that a man?"

*

Date: 24 Aug 1994 22:25:55 GMT

From: agate!darkstar.UCSC.EDU!news.hal.COM!olivea!korie!newsworthy.West.Sun.COM!
abyss.West.Sun.COM!bigboy!myers@ames.arpa

Subject: Repeater Coordination (quasi-repost)

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <33ggdc\$8os@agate.berkeley.edu> kennish@kabuki.EECS.Berkeley.EDU (Ken
A. Nishimura) writes:

>

>Under what circumstances should a repeater coordinating
>body automatically re-coordinate a repeater which has
>changed trustees?

In an ideal, non-political world, the coordination serves to minimize
mutual interference. If the repeater remains unchanged, i.e., site,
power, antenna, etc., then the coordinating body need not be involved,
other than updating records on how to contact the trustee.

In the real world, coordinating bodies do all kinds of interesting things.

>If a repeater is sold from one party to another, should the
>coordination automatically transfer along with the physical
>machine?

Again, as long as the repeater is unchanged, there's no change in the
interference concern, and the coordinating body need only update the
contact information.

--

* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ, DoD#: j | Views expressed here are

*

* (310) 348-6043 | mine and do not necessarily *

* Dana.Myers@West.Sun.Com | reflect those of my employer

*

* "Sir, over there.... is that a man?"

*

Date: 25 Aug 94 16:16:32 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!news.Stanford.EDU!
abercrombie.Stanford.EDU!paulf@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994Aug23.204152.19994@mixcom.mixcom.com>,
<wyn.151.2E5B3D76@ornl.gov>, <33g310\$8kq@abyss.West.Sun.COM>
Subject : Re: CW VIEWS

myers@bigboy.West.Sun.COM (Dana Myers) writes:

>Amateur radio is a service, but it isn't a service like the telephone
>company. Amateur radio is an experimental radio service, and Part 97.1
>lays down exactly what the US Amateur Radio Service is expected to do.

What you've claimed here is that amateur radio is **solely** an experimental
radio service, which of course doesn't cut it. Experimentation is only one
of about a dozen or so pursuits within the hobby. You might not be happy
pursuing those aspects, but they do exist, and I daresay there are more of
them than you.

If you're attempting non-hobby experimentation, then recourse to the
Experimental Service is strongly suggested.

--

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The Enemy of the Good is the Better."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Gen. William "Wild Bill" Donovan

Date: Wed, 24 Aug 1994 16:28:00 EST
From: agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!amcomp!dan@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <wyn.149.2E59FAC4@ornl.gov>,
<1994Aug23.204152.19994@mixcom.mixcom.com>, <wyn.151.2E5B3D76@ornl.gov>
Subject : Re: CW VIEWS

wyn@ornl.gov (C. C. (Clay) Wynn, N4AOX) writes:

>In article <1994Aug23.204152.19994@mixcom.mixcom.com> kevin jessup
<kevin.jessup@mixcom.mixcom.com> writes:

>

>>Yes. We ARE a service, right? To continue to provide "service" we must
>>remain technically viable, right? We must COMPETE for spectrum access
>>with other COMMUNICATION services, right?

>

>I don't think so. I believe the service was created to spare the commercial
>world of any competitive notions the operators might have. Ops are not allowed
>to do the things that would compete with commercial services, like charge
>money for air time, broadcast, carry business oriented traffic, etc. Part 97
>speaks clearly (or it used to) on this subject.

---Quote---

97.1 Basis and purpose.

The rules and regulations in this Part are designed to provide an amateur radio service having a fundamental purpose as expressed in the following principles:

(a) Recognition and enhancement of the value of the amateur service to the public as a voluntary noncommercial *communication service*, particularly with respect to providing emergency communications.

---End Quote---

{emphs. added} Well seems that Part 97, and thus the FCC, disagree with you Clay. We ARE a COMMUNICATIONS SERVICE. Hummmm...

---Begin Quote Again---

(b) Continuation and extension of the amateur's proven ability to contribute to the advancement of the radio art.

(c) Encouragement and improvement of the amateur service through rules which provide for advancing skills in both the communications and technical phases of the art.

(d) Expansion of the existing reservoir within the amateur radio service of trained operators, technicians, and electronics experts.

(e) Continuation and extension of the amateur's unique ability to enhance international goodwill.

---End Quote---

Well, nothing in there about competitive notions. Just not commercial. Since we are not talking about commercial stuff...

>>>>We are NOT asking for a free ride

>

>More and more, it appears that "we" are asking for a free ride, just another
>hitch hiker on the RF highways, dodging those commercial common carrier
>tariffs. Your explanation of the situation using the OSI model points that
>out. Let the physical layer be a common carrier, just like ethernet cable.
>Don't bother me with things like propagation, gentlemen's agreements,
>allocations, etc. Just give me good S/N, plenty of bandwidth and let me do my
>"advanced communications" stuff on the higher levels, as long as it is free
>of course.

Gee, I would like to know where you read that. Other than in YOUR posts.
Why are you making a statement against a concept that no one has proposed?
Trying to win a debate by misdirection? Would someone posting from a .gov
account do that?

>The frustrated Amateurs Into Digital Stuff and Amateur Network Utilitization

>Teams should try fiber optics. Great advances in that area. QRM proof,
>no EMI in or out, now up to 1 Gigabit/sec/mile without repeaters or amps.
>Oh, and you don't have to ever worry again about the ARRL, or those troublesome
>CW requirements.

Typical. Leave me alone. I am the only thing preserving the history of
RADIO. TO HELL with the fact that we are defined as a COMMUNICATIONS
SERVICE in part 97. I (hear the whine) wanna preserve RADIO!

Dan (Looking at who's whineing now) N8PKV

--

"They that can give up an essential liberty to obtain a little temporary
safety deserve neither liberty nor safety." -- Benjamin Franklin

- Misspelled? Impossible, my modem is error correcting!

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #394
